

## REMARKS

Applicant's representative would like to thank the Examiner for granting a telephone interview on October 3, 2007 in which the status of the pending application and how to best move the case forward procedurally were discussed.

The Office Action dated September 5, 2007 claims 1,4, 7-12 and 32-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Bernardo et al. Claim 5 has been canceled. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claim 1 now recites with more specificity the elements of the plurality of applications as having a first model object relating to a Web site building application and a second model object that may be added to the first without altering the extensible framework of the Web site building application and containing Web site fixed application data and extensible application data. Support for these amendments may be found at page 16, lines 6-13, page 17, lines 7-9, and page 20, lines 12-13. Neither *Lee* or *Bernardo* teach, show or suggest these limitations alone or in combination.

Claim 1 now also recites a contextual template system, including a context information record having a requires section, an exclusion section, and a mandatory determination section, represented as a list of context check identifiers. Support for these limitations may be found at page 24, line 1 to page 25, line 22. The claim now also recites that the software architecture is a reactive architecture which supports levels of task granularity and is dynamically aware of what information has been entered by a user. The claim also recites that the extensible attributes of a data object provide a standard way of representing a previously undefined attribute. Support for this limitation may be found at page 11, lines 21-23. Page 3, lines 2-8 states that the presently claimed invention enables "continual advancement and integration of new e-business capabilities into a single framework." Applicant believes that these amendments are not taught, shown or suggested by *Lee* or *Bernardo* either alone or in combination.

For at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 4, 7-12 and 32 to 36, all directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, are not unpatentable over *Lee* in view of *Bernardo*.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or that an Examiner's Amendment would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Rupak Nag/

Rupak Nag  
Reg. No. 37,493

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
Telephone: (612) 252-3335